

defendant in this action. Defendant implied all duties such as the duty to inspect, the duty to warn, and all maintenance duties were delegated when an independent contractor takes control over a particular section of roadway.

{¶ 4} 4) Furthermore, defendant denied that neither DOT nor National had any notice of metal debris on the roadway prior to plaintiff's damage occurrence. Defendant professed DOT first received notice of a debris problem on August 9, 2005, when plaintiff filed a damage incident report. Defendant stated the origin of the debris is unknown, but denied the debris emanated from roadway construction activity. Defendant speculated, the debris could have been dropped from another vehicle not associated with DOT or National.

{¶ 5} 5) Plaintiff did not present any evidence to indicate the length of time the debris condition was present on the roadway prior to his property damage occurrence.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶ 6} 1) The duty of DOT to maintain the roadway in a safe drivable condition is not delegable to an independent contractor involved in roadway construction. DOT may bear liability for the negligent acts of an independent contractor charged with roadway construction. See *Cowell v. Ohio Department of Transportation*, 2003-09343-AD, jud, 2004-Ohio-151.

{¶ 7} 2) Defendant has the duty to maintain its highway in a reasonably safe condition for the motoring public. *Knickel v. Ohio Department of Transportation* (1976), 49 Ohio App. 2d 335. However, defendant is not an insurer of the safety of its

highways. See *Kniskern v. Township of Somerford* (1996), 112 Ohio App. 3d 189; *Rhodus v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.* (1990), 67 Ohio App. 3d 723.

{¶ 8} 3) In order to recover in any suit involving injury proximately caused by roadway conditions including debris, plaintiff must prove either: 1) defendant had actual or constructive notice of the debris and failed to respond in a reasonable time or responded in a negligent manner, or 2) that defendant, in a general sense, maintains its highways negligently. *Denis v. Department of Transportation* (1976), 75-0287-AD.

{¶ 9} 4) Defendant is only liable for roadway conditions of which it has notice, but fails to reasonably correct. *Bussard v. Dept. of Transp.* (1986), 31 Ohio Misc. 2d 1.

{¶ 10} 5) Plaintiff has not produced any evidence to indicate the length of time the debris condition was present on the roadway prior to the incident forming the basis of this claim. No evidence has been submitted to show defendant had actual notice of the debris. Additionally, the trier of fact is precluded from making an inference of defendant's constructive notice, unless evidence is presented in respect to the time the debris appeared on the roadway. *Spires v. Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262. There is no indication defendant had constructive notice of the debris. Plaintiff has not produced any evidence to infer defendant, in a general sense, maintains its highways negligently or that defendant's acts caused the defective condition. *Herlihy v. Ohio Department of*

Having considered all the evidence in the claim file and, for the reasons set forth in the memorandum decision filed concurrently herewith, judgment is rendered in favor of defendant. Court costs are assessed against plaintiff. The clerk shall serve upon all parties notice of this judgment and its date of entry upon the journal.

DANIEL R. BORCHERT
Deputy Clerk

Entry cc:

Robert Dalton
11951 Center Village Road
Westerville, Ohio 43082

Plaintiff, Pro se

Gordon Proctor, Director
Department of Transportation
1980 West Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43223

For Defendant

RDK/laa
2/7
Filed 2/28/06
Sent to S.C. reporter 3/24/06